

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

**Status of Claims:**

No claims are currently being cancelled.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-8, 12-14, 20 and 23 are currently being amended.

No claims are currently being added.

This amendment amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-26 are pending in this application.

**Indication of Allowable Subject Matter:**

Applicants appreciate the indication in the Office Action that claims 5 and 20 contain allowable subject matter. By way of this amendment and reply, claims 5 and 20 have each been placed in independent form to include the limitations of their respective base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, claims 5 and 20 are now believed to be in allowable form.

**Claim Objection – Claim 13:**

In the Office Action, claim 13 was objected to for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. By way of this amendment and reply, claim 13 has been amended to overcome this objection.

**Claim Rejections – Prior Art:**

In the Office Action, claims 1-2, 10-15, 22-24 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,999,718 to Arai; claims 3-4, 6, 18-19, 21 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,837,636 to Daniele

et al.; and claims 7-9 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,148,287 to Kemmochi et al. These rejections are traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

For one thing, Arai does not disclose or suggest pulse width modulators as clearly recited in the presently pending independent claims under rejection.

In particular, claim 1 recites a plurality of modulators for modulating a plurality of control signals for respectively scanning corresponding successive pixels along the same "common scan line", in order to increase a laser drive signal. Thus, in the light beam scanning apparatus in accordance with the present invention, each of the plurality of control signals are processed separately in order to increase the processing speed of the image data to be scanned.

On the contrary, Arai as depicted in Fig. 1 of that reference, teaches to simply change a pattern signal for driving a laser beam depending upon a document mode, i.e., a line image or a half-tone image, by using two J-K flip-flops. Thus, Arai does not teach or suggest the scanning of successive pixels along the same, "common scan line".

Accordingly, since none of the other cited art of record rectifies the above-mentioned deficiencies of Arai, presently pending independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited art of record.

With respect to presently pending dependent claim 3, each of the modulators outputs a modulated signal for a successive pixel data on the common scan line. Daniele et al., which is cited with Arai against claim 3, does not teach or suggest such a feature.

Since Arai also does not teach or suggest such a feature, claim 3 is patentable over the cited art of record, beyond the reasons set forth above with respect to its base claim.

Presently pending independent claims 14 and 23 each recite the "successive pixels along a common scan line" feature that is discussed above

with respect to claim 1, whereby this feature is not disclosed or suggested by Arai, or by any of the other cited art of record. Accordingly, presently pending claims 14 and 23, as well as their respective dependent claims, are also patentable over the cited art of record.

**Conclusion:**

Since all of the objections and rejections raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

November 23, 2004

By

Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 945-6162  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Pavan K. Agarwal  
Registration No. 40,888  
  
Phillip J. Articola  
Registration No. 38,819